

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/714,430	RIGNEY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David Turocy	1762	

All Participants:

(1) David Turocy.

(2) Christine Wilkes Beninati.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 24 October 2005

Time: 11:00 am

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

independent claims

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner inquired with Ms. Wilkes Beninati about a claim clarification, where the phrase "without a weight penalty" was clarified. Ms. Wilkes Beninati clarified a weight penalty exists if the post coated wieght is greater then the weight prior to engine run. Therefore the phrase "without a weight penalty" is to be read as requiring the weight after repair to be no greater then the weight prior to the first engine run.